DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 221 771 CG 016 196

AUTHOR Roe, Betty Boyd
TITLE An Analysis of Career Enrichment Needs and Programs for Student Affairs Personnel.
PUB DATE May 81
NOTE 78p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Personnel and Guidance Association (Detroit, MI, March 17-20, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Developmental Programs; Employee Attitudes; Higher Education; *Job Enrichment; *Job Satisfaction; Needs Assessment; Occupational Mobility; Occupational Surveys; *Professional Development; Student Personnel Services; *Student Personnel Workers; Underemployment; *Vocational Adjustment; Work Attitudes

ABSTRACT

Many student personnel professionals find that declining enrollments are affecting the supply and demand for their services. To assess current career needs and programs and to determine whether student personnel staff perceived a need for personal career enrichment, student personnel workers (N=183) in three state universities were surveyed. Results indicated a significant need for career enrichment programs but a limited opportunity for participation. Those professionals who had been employed for 6 to 10 years were the most viable candidates for career enrichment programs. Their responses indicated feelings of being underemployed and unchallenged. Persons employed from 3 to 5 years in student personnel services expressed uncertainty about future job plans. The findings suggest that this group of professionals may need help to determine job preferences. The appendices contain the questionnaire and interview forms. Throughout the document, 16 tables of statistical data are provided to illustrate the findings. (JAC)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED221771

HARD COPY NOT AVAILABLE

# AN ANALYSIS OF CAREER ENRICHMENT NEEDS AND PROGRAMS FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS PERSONNEL

BY

BETTY BOYD ROE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Betty Boyd Roe

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CG 016196

Submitted in fulfillment for the requirements
for Sabbatical Leave from the
Office of Student Affairs
University of Minnesota
May, 1981

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

A special note of thanks is due to those who helped in the organization of the study. Tom Goodale and Art Sandeen of the University of Florida, Bob Shaffer and Tom Schreck of Indiana University, Frank Wilderson and Ron Matross of the University of Minnesota all lent support to the project beyond what is normally expected. The reward of working with such professionals was indeed an enriching career experience. To my husband, Rodger Hough, my thanks and graditude for making this experience the best year of my life.

B. B. R.

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| Chapter | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| I. | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| | Background of the Study | 1 |
| | Statement of the Problem | 3 |
| | Expected Uses of the Study | 3 |
| | Definition of Terms | 4 |
| | Delimitations of the Study | 4 |
| II. | REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH | 6 |
| | Job Satisfaction Studies | 6 |
| | Job Motivation Studies | 6 |
| | Job Enrichment Studies | 9 |
| | Personnel Studies and Programs | 11 |
| | Summary | 13 |
| III. | METHODOLOGY | 15 |
| | Means of Collecting the Data | 15 |
| | Measures of Assessing a Career Enrichment Environment | 16 |
| | Perceived Mobility | 17 |
| | Current Job Satisfaction | 17 |
| | A Need for Career Enrichment Opportunity Perceived as a Problem | 18 |
| | Organizational Data About Departments | 18 |
| | Selection of Instruments | 19 |
| | Statistical Treatment of the Data | 20 |
| IV. | ANALYSIS OF DATA | 22 |
| | Demographics of Student Personnel Workers | 22 |
| | Measures of Conditions Producing A Climate for Career Enrichment | 23 |
| | Current Job Market Data | 24 |
| | Variables Affecting Desire for Career Enrichment | 29 |
| | Employee Perceptions of Job Mobility | 33 |
| | Current Job Satisfaction | 37 |
| | Opportunity for Professional Development | 38 |
| | Benefits of Professional Development | 41 |
| | Organizational Data About Departments | 43 |
| V. | SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS | 45 |
| | Summary of the Problem, Procedures, and Results | 45 |
| | Conclusions | 47 |
| | Recommendations | 48 |

Chapter Page

BIBLIOGRAPHY ..... 49

APPENDIX ..... 52

Appendix A: Questionnaire Mailed to Subjects ..... 52
Appendix B: Cover Letters for Questionnaire Mailed to Subjects ..... 61
Appendix C: Questionnaire Reminder Notice ..... 64
Appendix D: Interview Form ..... 68
Appendix E: Units Interviewed ..... 71

LIST OF TABLES


| Table | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Labor Force and Unemployment by State and Selected Metropolitan Areas | 24 |
| 2 | Employees on Nonagricultural Payrolls for States and Selected Areas | 25 |
| 3 | Positions Available as Advertised in the Chronicle | 26 |
| 4 | Relationship Preference for a More Intellectually Demanding Job to Length of Employment in Current Position | 30 |
| 5 | Relationship of Plans to be in the Same Type of Work in Five Years to Length of Employment in Current Job | 31 |
| 6 | Underemployment in Current Job to Length of Employment in Current Job | 32 |
| 7 | Relationship of Job Choice and Length of Employment in Current Job | 32 |
| 8 | Relationship of a Considered Change in Occupation and Length of Employment in Current Job | 33 |
| 9 | Relationship of Necessity of Cut in Pay to Change Job by Institution | 35 |
| 10 | Relationship of Salary to Institution | 36 |
| 11 | Relationship of Length of Employment in Current Position to Length of Employment at University | 36 |
| 12 | Frequency Distribution of Employees with No Opportunity to Participate in Programs | 39 |
| 13 | Percentage of Respondents Who Would "Like to Try" Professional Development Programs by Type of Program | 39 |
| 14 | Institutional Preference for Programs by Type of Program | 40 |
| 15 | Percentage of Respondents by Institution Who Have Participated by Type of Program | 41 |
| 16 | Percentage of Respondents Indicating How Programs Helped Career Advancement and Job Effectiveness | 42 |

# CHAPTER I

# INTRODUCTION

## Background of the Study

During the past decade, there have been indications that economic conditions for higher education have tightened. Federal monies have been redistributed away from colleges and universities. State legislatures have felt the need to reallocate tax dollars to other areas. Gifts and endowments to higher education institutions dipped at the beginning of the decade for the first time in ten years. In addition, the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges reported "stand-still" budgets or less for their member institutions (Crowl, 1971). Nationally, inflation was reported in double-digit figures. Surveys of the general public reported that they were disillusioned with higher education and what it could do. The College Placement Council announced that there were fewer jobs for college graduates (Semas, 1971).

Ten years later, conditions are still in a period of uncertainty. The Association Council for Policy Analysis and Research reviewed the financial trends of the 1970's and concluded that the erosion of capital in higher education was severe. In a report issued in early 1981, they called for a change in tax laws to encourage individual gifts to colleges and universities, noting that endowments were failing to keep pace with inflation (Magarrell, 1981. b). The report issued by the association stated that higher education is experiencing a depletion of human, physical and financial resources. While the Census Bureau estimates that the percentage of 18-year-olds in the population is still declining, actual college enrollment figures are up. The Chronicle

of Higher Education reported that an explanation for this increase is the lack of attractive jobs for high school graduates (Magarrell, 1981 a). An alternative to work is attending college. No doubt the actual number of students who matriculate will be influenced by the availability of student aid funds. This matter is still in a period of flux. The extent congress will accept reductions in student aid as proposed by President Reagan is not yet known.

Against this economic background, the academicians have been vocal about future declines in enrollments and their effect upon legislative requests. Enrollments are projected to decline in 1983 and again in 1991, (Kerr, 1981). One direct effect of these declines is projected to be a decrease in the addition of young faculty. Academia realizes that during the next twenty years the retirement rate will continue to be low and that faculty who do retire may not be replaced in a retrenchment effort. Current articles in the literature state the perceived lack of opportunity on the part of current faculty will have a detrimental effort on their work and will discourage the most capable candidates for prospective faculty from entering the field. As a result, effective teaching and quality of research will deterioriate.

As a microcosm of higher education, it is reasonable to believe that student affairs divisions may experience similar problems. Many student personnel professionals may find, like their academic counterparts, that declining enrollments may effect the supply and demand for their services. Like many faculty, many student personnel workers were hired during the 1960's and 1970's. There could be a few retirements among their number, advancements may be slow, chances of employment at other institutions experiencing similar problems may be lower, and jobs available in related

fields may be in greater demand. In three to five years, lack of job mobility could be one of the major areas of concern for those hired during the 1960's and 1970's. Although enrollments may rise as predicted by 2010 to approximately the 1979 level, (Kerr, 1981) it will be thirty years too late to help many of the current workers in the Student Personnel field.

## Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to determine whether one particular group of university employees perceived a need for career enrichment. The investigation was designed to assess current career needs and programs; and to recommend programs to address those needs. The study answered for each of three campuses the following questions about their student personnel employees:

1. Is there a need for a career enrichment program within the Student Affairs Division?
2. What are the current opportunities for enrichment furnished to Student Affairs personnel?
3. What are the opinions of Student Affairs personnel about current career enrichment programs and need for improvement?
4. What kinds of career enrichment programs should be provided for Student Affairs personnel?

The answers to these questions were hypothesised to be as follows:

1. A need for career enrichment will be established.
2. The current opportunities provided will not be adequate to meet the needs of employees.
3. Employees will express a desire for career enrichment.
4. Review of the literature with suggestions from employees will direct the formulation of enrichment programs.

## Expected Uses for the Study

The results of this study could have significance for any institution of higher education which is concerned about meeting the enrichment needs

of their employees. Both internal and external comparative data for departments within the division of Student Affairs are provided. The study compares the perceived needs of employees for career enrichment and the current programs offered in three institutions within the Student Affairs division.

The study also provides data to determine the influence of the variables which alter employee perceptions about their careers. These data can be compared to organizational goals in other higher education institutions to formulate programs which can augment employee career plans. Programs designed to benefit both employee and department have the potential to produce higher rewards for all concerned.

## Definition of Terms

The term career enrichment is defined as a change in job functions or level of responsibilities so that it is possible for a person to improve or demonstrate present skills, knowledge, performance and productivity.

The term personal development is defined as an improvement in skills, knowledge, performance and productivity so that it is possible for a person to change his job functions or level of responsibility.

The term professional development is defined as any improvement a person makes in either the areas of career enrichment or personal development.

The term insulator is defined as any variable which alters the impact of the environment.

## Delimitations of the Study

This study used as a sample the total population of full-time professional student personnel staff in three state universities. Subjects in each of the three institutions were drawn from job categories which have

direct contact with students as their primary employment function. In all three cases, the institution had experienced some degree of budgetary curtailment during the past five years. Only departments within the division of Student Affairs which provided comparables between universities were used.

# CHAPTER II

## Review of Related Research

From a review of the related research, it was ascertained that the concept of career enrichment was closely related to other theories of behavioral scientists. The studies leading to the formulation of a career enrichment definition and the basis of this research fell into four major categories: Job Satisfaction Studies; Job Motivation Studies; Job Enrichment Studies; and Personnel Studies and Programs.

### Job Satisfaction Studies

Hoppock (1935) was the first of the early scientists to study job satisfaction. His study is still used today as a model of in-depth research and investigation in the field. His book included two separate studies. He interviewed the working population of an entire town in one study and used selected samples of satisfied and dissatisfied teachers in the other. His intensive study included structured interviews, survey techniques and testing of subjects. His work instigated survey research departments at many universities in the late 1930's. Through the years survey methods have been refined and analysis of data have been placed on the computer, but little knowledge on job satisfaction has been added to Hoppock's original work. Even his format for asking questions has remained essentially the same for current day researchers. His format was utilized in Section III of the questionnaire used in this study.

### Job Motivation Studies

Closely tied to job satisfaction studies are those theories about what motivates an employee to produce on the job. The following theories

were reviewed as they contributed to the body of knowledge on motivation. While not an inclusive review, these behavioral scientists have made the major contribution in this area of study.

Maslow (1954) viewed satisfaction as a vital element in his need hierarchy concept. He suggested that the efforts to motivate employees must be consistant with the theory that a satisfied need will not motivate. He maintained that the higher order needs of esteem and self-actualization must be the acknowledged motivators as lower order needs are fulfilled.

Herzberg (1959, 1966) looked at work satisfaction from a different perspective. He analyzed motivation and maintenance factors of the job. The maintenance factors are involved with the Job Environment and Herzberg has labeled them the Hygiene Factors. The "Job Itself" is what Herzberg recognized as the Motivation Factors of work. Herzberg found in his studies that the absence of dissatisfaction did not produce satisfaction with the job. Just as water purification and garbage disposal don't make people healthy, environment conditions do not motivate workers. These hygiene factors merely keep people from being unhealthy or dissatisfied. When the environment is clean, employees are at point zero on the demotivation-motivation scale. The hygiene factors must be continuously maintained just to keep an employee's dissatisfaction level at zero. Herzberg placed salary, policy and administration, interpersonal relationships, supervision, and working conditions into his hygiene factors category. He used salary in an example of how a hygiene factor works. Persons who are unhappy with their salaries may temporarily find themselves no longer unhappy when they get raises just as a hungry person who eats is temporarily not dissatisfied. The person will get hungry again and will have to eat again. The "Work Itself Factors" were those Herzberg found to operate as need satisfiers. These were the factors which he believed will motivate employees. He listed the motivating

factors as responsibility, achievement, recognition, and growth and development.

Hampton (1977) has pointed out that Maslow and Herzberg's theories are related. He designed a model that demonstrated Herzberg's Hygiene Factors included Maslow's lower hierarchy needs. Likewise, he showed that Herzberg's motivators were the higher needs in Maslow's theory. Maslow called these higher needs esteem and self-actualization.

McGregor (1960, 1967) looked at contrasting assumptions about attitudes toward work. His Theory X describes those managers who operate under the assumption that employees find work distasteful, were not ambitious, had little desire for responsibility, and had little capacity for creativity. Those who believed this must closely control employees and they often will coerce workers to achieve organizational objectives. Motivation was believed to occur only at the physiological and safety levels. McGregor saw managers who operate with Theory Y assumptions as seeing that work can be fun, that employees will accept responsibility, and that creativity in organizational problem solving may be widely distributed among employees. Managers who operated under this Y Theory would allow workers to be self-directed because they were properly motivated. Their motivation occurred at the social, esteem and self-actualization levels as well as at the physiological and safety levels.

Closely akin to McGregor's theories was one by Likert (1961). He developed four organizational model systems. McGregor's Theory X type of manager actually was like Likert's System 1 manager and what McGregor describes as Theory Y was similar to Likert's System 4 manager. Blake and Mouton (1964) integrated the work of McGregor and Likert into a 9/9 manager scale. Their work has been used in various managerial and leadership seminars. The scale

categorized managers and leaders into people versus output orientations. A 9/9 manager was one who is high people/high output oriented.

A discussion of motivation theories would not be complete without including those who practice behavior modification. These theorists approach motivation in a direct method avoiding the humanistic methods. Skinner (1954), Thorndike (1913) and Watson (1924) were advocates of "operant conditioning" to change behavior in work situations. Claims for behavior modification include greater job satisfaction for employees and better results for the employer.

Dawis and Lofquist (1976, 1978) claim a new view of motivation. They see motivation in the context of the individual interacting with the environment. An analysis of this interaction defined motivation as the maintenance type and the dissatisfaction type. Maintenance motivation maintained the every-day work behavior, while dissatisfaction motivation was the force or generator for change. Both of these types of motivation may be divided into two subclasses: response motivation and stimulus motivation. The authors also discussed a third type of motivation called "high performance". While occuring less frequently than the other two types, high performance motivation was observed by surges of creative activity or in the behavior of workaholics.

## Job Enrichment Studies

Of all the behavioral scientists, Herzberg has been the most influential in generating study in job enrichment. He pointed out (Herzberg, 1968) that meaningless changes in the tasks that workers are assigned have not motivated employees. He stated that the only way to motivate an employee is to give him challenging work where he can assume responsibility. Herzberg pointed out that horizontal job loading is not job enrichment. Multiplying adding, subtracting or dividing a meaningless zero job still leaves a zero job.

Ford (1969) took Herzberg's theories and applied them at the American Telephone and Telegraph Company. He found that if worker abilities are underutilized, alienation from work will result. Even if workers are reasonably paid, when their abilities are not used, they feel they are only working for money. Ford (1979) pointed out that the term "enrichment" is outdated. What really needs to be done to jobs is redesign. He found that jobs tend to die as organizations grow in size. He applied Herzberg's theory and redesigned jobs at AT&T so that a small group of workers were able to follow a project from its conception to its completion. He found that for workers the fun of a job was to plan it, organize it and to execute it. Experience showed that employees had to have the opportunity of exercising control over the job or neither higher job satisfaction nor improved performance would result. Finally Ford found that a person with a complete piece of work and control over the work, but without regular and consistent feedback, was not likely to make good decisions.

Yorks (1979) pointed out that the critics of job enrichment have exaggerated their claims of failure. While it is not surprising that enrichment programs have not been the answer to all motivational problems, it also is not surprising that what some companies have called enrichment changes were not changes at all. Yorks predicted that there will be no national revolution in work restructuring on the immediate horizon. Organizations are inherently conservative with structural innovations and usually respond to severe operating pressures. Yorks did not forecast a national crisis significant enough to require job redesign by American corporations.

Yorks (1976) also pointed out that motivation cannot be plugged into an individual. Motivation is already there in the worker. Structural changes which provide opportunities for employees to satisfy important needs will generate a motivated work force.

One of the few applications of enrichment with professionals was a study by Ritti (1971). He showed that job enrichment meant something different for professional workers than for clerical workers. He found that professional engineers were disappointed in their expectations. Definitions of success were the traditional ones for engineers. They expected upward mobility into management positions. When management positions were limited and expectations were not met, then enrichment was needed. These professionals had a surplus of motivation and a desire to do more. Therefore, Ritti found no need to reconstitute tasks to enhance motivation, but a need to use the motivation already there. He pointed out that the opportunity to learn and to develop new skills must be salient to any job enrichment program.

## Personnel Studies and Programs

Closely related studies were found about various personnel in education and business. In an unpublished attitudial study done at the University of Minnesota, aspects of satisfaction were analyzed for civil service employees (Industrial Relations Center, 1979). The study found the positive areas with which employees expressed satisfaction were the chance to develop new and better ways to do their jobs; the finge benefit package; and the competence of their immediate supervisor. Areas of concern where employees expressed dissatisfaction were their ability to be promoted or advanced; the way pay raises were determined; inconsistent policies and practices; and interdepartmental communication. The study indicated that there were issues that warrented attention especially in the areas of employee recognition, management affectiveness and in communication. The results also showed that there was employee goodwill toward the organization. In another unpublished study, LeVine, Abbott, and Barber (1980) assessed Resident Hall Assistants' job satisfaction

and motivation. Using the residence hall staff of two institutions, they found that most of the job characteristics tested were ranked in the same importance between the institutions. Furthermore, the most important job characteristics to staffs were those that Herzberg classified as the Motivation Factors.

Attitudes toward jobs and work have been heavily featured in the media. Johnson (1980) pointed out in a newspaper article that vacations, as part of the fringe benefit package, tell us about the job itself. There has been a movement toward longer vacations and more holidays as a way of avoiding the need to make jobs more rewarding. He pointed out that this says to workers not to expect self-actualization on the job or to be able to satisfy needs through work. All that is to be done away from the job.

Burnout has been discussed as a contributing factor to way jobs no longer satisfy teachers. Scanlon (1980b) found that some teachers were finding the pressures so great on the job that many were abandoning their careers. Teachers cite lack of respect from students, lack of support from administrators, lower salaries and declining enrollments as causes for their stress. Scanlon (1980a) found that the teachers most likely to leave the profession were male secondary teachers in their 30's. Most of the teachers who quit also had between five and eight years of teaching experience.

For many persons burnout appears at mid-life. Typical of the literature focused on this subject of mid-life crisis is from Hallberg (1980). He quoted research from the U.S. Department of Labor that showed movement up the occupational ladder for men is largely completed by age 35. Mid-life crisis has been treated in the literature chiefly as a syndrome affecting men. It has been described as a feeling of entrapment. Remedies suggested by

Hallberg were to take a sabbatical, set new career goals, find a second career, enlarge the current job, start training new personnel, move toward more control in current work, and cultivate new interests.

How do you know if you have Burnout? Freudenberger (1980) lists the symptoms as exhaustion, detachment, boredom, impatience, a sense of omnipotence, feelings of not being appreciated, paranoia, disorientation, psychosomatic complaints and depression. While the list sounds frightening, Freudenberger pointed out that they are regarded only as symptoms. The real danger he claimed is the denial that anything is wrong.

There are two major ways of contending with dissatisfaction on the job in the literature. Becker (1979) discussed one way. He suggested changing jobs or divorcing the present employer. He pointed out that divorce from a job was a gradual process. First came frustration, then futility and then the extra time and effort to the job was discontinued. The employee only put in the time and energy necessary to survive. This stage he called psychological separation. When this stage is reached Becker recommended that the employee divorce the organization.

Job changes may be one solution. The Research Institute of America (1978) suggested that those dissatisfied in their current positions learn to live on the promotion plateau. They outlined the options, other than changing careers, as 1) staying in current position and enriching the job, 2) looking for a job change within the organization, or 3) enriching the personal life.

## Summary

What the related literature signifies is that a problem with job satisfaction and motivation exists for a segment of the population. This segment is large enough to warrent an increasing body of research on the topic.

While job enrichment is not the answer to all organizational problems about motivation, it is a method of improving the work environment. This study endeavored to examine a special group of employees in the course of their careers and to make a distinction between jobs and careers in suggesting methods of enrichment.

# CHAPTER III

## Methodology

The investigation of the questions raised in the statement of the problem required the comparison of three Student Affairs staffs in three universities in three communities. The institutions used were the University of Minnesota, Indiana University, and the University of Florida. These institutions were selected to represent a geographic span from north to south. This span was chosen to see if the same environmental stresses were at work in distinct parts of the country. In addition both the University of Minnesota and Indiana University are Big 10 institutions. Should this affilitation have influence organizationally or philosophically upon subjects' answers, a comparison with the University of Florida would act as a control factor. The institutions used in the study were all financially state supported. The methodological considerations included the means of collecting the data, measures of assessing a career enrichment environment, perceived mobility, current job satisfaction, need for career enrichment opportunity, organizational data about departments, selectivity of instruments used, and statistical treatment of the data.

### Means of Collecting the Data

Collection of the data took place in December, 1980 and in the months of January and February, 1981. A mailing of the questionnaire (See Appendix A) was made to a total sample of 209 subjects. There were 112 subjects in Minnesota, 56 in Florida and 41 in Indiana. A questionnaire return of 94 percent was recognized for Minnesota, 86 percent for Florida, and 93 for Indiana. Of this number, four respondents indicated that they were not

full-time employees and were cast out of the results. Another three subjects returned the questionnaire without filling it out and were thereby eliminated from the study. The final result of usable questionnaires was 101 from Minnesota, 47 from Florida, and 35 from Indiana.

## Measures of Assessing a Career Enrichment Environment

There were two measures to assess the conditions which were believed to contribute to the climate in which career enrichment programs would be desired. Job mobility was viewed as an indicator of job opportunity. Trends in national employment were considered important as an influence upon perceptions of the subjects toward their job mobility. Unemployment figures from the United States Department of Labor and growth rates were used to establish the employment climate. More specifically, the availability of traditional student personnel jobs was viewed as an influence upon perceived job mobility. Notices for student personnel jobs in the Chronicle of Higher Education were surveyed and faculty in student personnel training programs in the three institutions were contacted to determine the status of graduate enrollments and placements. Professional organizations were contacted also for figures from their placement services. Locally, job mobility was determined by the number of new employees, number of retirees, and the number of internal promotions (including reclassifications) in each of the three universities. Heads of departments were interviewed to determine these numbers.

The second measure of assessing conditions which would foster a need for career enrichment was a set of variables which were believed to act as either positive or negative insulators to an employee's desire for career enrichment.

1. Age - those employees nearing retirement were not expected to desire career enrichment.

2. Departmental budget restrictions - those employees in departments where budgets have not been seriously curtailed or threatened were expected not to perceive mobility as a great problem and therefore the need for enrichment would be less.

3. Transferable job skills - those employees who possessed or believed that they possessed transferable job skills would desire less career enrichment.

4. History of employment in the department - those employees who have been in their job for less than two years would desire less career enrichment.

5. Geographical restrictions - those employees who felt they could not leave the geographical area because of family ties or for job opportunities of their spouse would desire career enrichment.

6. Salary restrictions - those employees who believe their salaries have reached the level where a cut in pay would be necessary to leave their current jobs would desire career enrichment.

All of the above insulators were expected to affect employee perceptions. Data was gathered from a questionnaire entitled Professional Development Questionnaire and was verified where possible with university officials.

## Perceived Mobility

It was believed that the perceived mobility of the subjects would be more than the measurable components of employment conditions and the six insulating factors. Therefore data on the subjects' perceived mobility status was collected by questionnaire. These mobility status questions together with the demographic data were used as a measure of perceived mobility for the subjects.

## Current Job Satisfaction

It was a premise of this paper that job satisfaction in the current position would not be a factor in a desire for career enrichment. It

was reasoned that while those subjects who may be dissatisfied in their jobs would want career enrichment, the converse of this statement was not believed to be valid. Based upon related research, it was believed that a majority of the student personnel employees would like their jobs; but liking their jobs would not keep the subjects from wanting career enrichment.

## A Need for Career Enrichment Opportunity Perceived as a Problem

For purposes of this paper a distinction between career enrichment programs and personal development programs was made. Career enrichment programs are those that alter the job functions so that an employee may demonstrate present skills or knowledge. In order to determine whether employees in the Division of Student Affairs perceived a need for career enrichment, a combination of questions from the questionnaire were analyzed. The subjects were asked to comment on their opportunities for programs, participation in current programs, and the type of programs they would like to try in the future. In addition, subjects were asked to designate the methods of encouragement they had received from their departments to participate in such programs.

## Organizational Data About Departments

After a comparison of job mobility factors, and perceptions about career enrichment opportunities and needs, the director or coordinator of each major area was interviewed. These persons were viewed as being in a position to be knowledgeable about departmental policy and influential on both the philosophical and actual departmental programs. The departments included in the areas were central administration, research, housing, financial aids, student activities, fraternities, leadership, orientation, student unions, career placement, learning skills, counseling, discipline, drug abuse,

legal services, judicial, international, minority, women, handicapped, and veterans. The purpose of the interviews was to determine if there were staff development programs currently in existance, how much emphasis supervisors placed upon the programs, what the turn-over rate for employees was, and if budgetary restrictions were a problem. These department heads were also asked to contribute their ideas about any factor which would influence a need for career enrichment. The information gathered from these interviews were believed important as a verifier of actual programs in existance in the organization, as a determinant of sources of organizational encouragement to employees, and as an indicator of the scope of organizational influence upon employees.

As a method of visual aid help, a card with a partial listing of possible programs considered to be both career enrichment and personal development in nature was presented to those interviewed. They were asked if to their knowledge they had employees within their area of responsibility engaged in the listed programs. It was explained that this was not an inclusive list and those interviewed were asked to name also any program(s) not listed where their employees were active.

## Selection of the Instruments

All instruments used in the data gathering were prepared by the investigator. The questionnaire, entitled Professional Development Questionnaire, was developed to gather data about personal demographics, mobility status of the subject, the current job satisfaction level, perceived opportunities for professional development and what programs employees would like to try (see Appendix A). This questionnaire was mailed with a cover letter from the appropriate vice president in each of the three universities to the full time student personnel staff (see Appendix B). In this letter, the

vice president informed his staff about the purpose of the study and requested their cooperation. A self-addressed campus mail envelope to a disaffiliated academic department on each campus was included for the return of the questionnaires. One week after the initial mailing in all three institutions, a "reminder" was sent in the form of a holiday greetings card (see Appendix C). Two follow-up questionnaires approximately one month apart were sent to University of Minnesota subjects. Only one additional mailing at both Indiana University and the University of Florida was used.

The interview method was selected to contact the directors or area coordinators. A mimeographed form was used to insure the same information was collected from all subjects (see Appendix D). Subjects' answers were recorded on the forms for comparison purposes.

## Statistical Treatment of the Data

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, and Brent, 1975) was used to analyze data for the study. All the coding for the program was done by the investigator. Each institution and each subject was assigned code numbers which were punched into the 80-column cards. The first step in the data analysis was a frequency distribution showing how all 183 subjects answered each question in the questionnaire. The distribution characteristics were thereby established for the items. Comparisons of the three institutions were then made by running crosstabs on the items. The statistic used to measure the independence between the variables was the chi square. Chi square values of less then .20 were used as being significant. As Labovitz (1968) pointed out, there is nothing sacred about a .05 level of significance,

and in fact adhering closely to this level in sociological research could cause significant data to be overlooked. The following formula for chi square was used:

$$x^2 = \sum_i \frac{(f_o^i - f_e^i)^2}{f_e^i}$$

Finally, crosstabs of one variable by a second variable, controlling for a third variable were run on the three items listing professional development programs. The relationship between programs subjects would like to try and programs they have tried, controlling for the opportunity to participate was analyzed. Again the chi square test of significance was used to measure the independence between the variables.

# CHAPTER IV

## Analysis of Data

This chapter has four sections. The first section describes demographic data for student personnel workers. The second describes measures of conditions which might produce a climate for career enrichment. Conditions included in this section are the current job market data, variables affecting the desire for career enrichment, employee perspectives of job mobility and current job satisfaction. The third section describes respondents' view of professional development opportunities and their benefits, and the fourth considers organizational data about departments within each university.

### Demographics of Student Personnel Workers

Distinctions in the data did exist by institution, but several items were consistant in all three universities. The majority of student personnel employees in all three institutions hold a master's degree, they are under 40 years of age, they have been employed five or less years in their current jobs and are employed full-time for 12 months out of the year. In addition, 57 percent are currently married, with 49 percent having a spouse working either part or full time. A large majority of employees (including those not married) have neither school-age (74%) nor pre-school (84%) children living with them.

Although student personnel workers in the three institutions did not differ on these variables, Indiana University stood apart from the others on several other variables. The items of age, length of employment at the university, length of employment in current position, salary, and the percentage employed in Housing are believed to be the result of the large academic program in

student personnel. There were 43 percent of full-time employees at Indiana who were under 30 years of age. Compared to Minnesota's 17 percent and Florida's 36 percent of under 30 population, the Office of Student Affairs staff at Indiana is younger. Fifty-one percent of the Indiana staff have been in their current positions two years or less and 34 percent have been employed at the University five years or less. Both of these percentages are greater than for either of the other institutions (see Appendix A). Forty percent of Indiana Student Affairs staff is employed in Housing. This a contrast to the 14 percent at Minnesota and the 17 percent at Florida. Salaries at Indiana were shown to be lower. Fifty-seven percent of the student personnel employees earned below $15,000 per year as compared with 49 percent at Florida and ten percent at Minnesota. Many of these positions, however, are full-time internships which do not reflect a true salary. Waivers of tuition, free room and board, and academic credit for work are hidden factors.

## Measures of Conditions Producing a Climate for Career Enrichment

This section looks at four measures of conditions which may influence a need for career enrichment. They are the current job market, six possible variables effecting an employee's desire for enrichment, the perceived mobility status of employees, and the current job satisfaction of employees. The job market was assessed using national unemployment figures, the number of potential jobs available for student personnel employees and the status of graduate programs in each of the three institutions. It should be pointed out that a job market analysis would be a study into itself. It was not the intent of this paper to provide an analysis, but to find comparable employment data for each of the three states in which the universities were located.

Current Job Market Data

National statistical figures for unemployment were gathered from the U.S. Department of Labor. Historically in the past ten years, the civilian labor force has shown a variance in the unemployment rate of as much as 3.6 points. Going from a low figure in 1973 of 4.9 percent to a high figure of 8.5 percent in 1975, the current unemployment rate is 7.4 percent, (Employment and Earnings, 1981). This figure of 7.4 percent is the same rate that has prevailed since May of 1980 and therefore would be the rate quoted during the time that respondents in this study were filling out questionnaires. It is considered to be a relatively high rate of unemployment by the U.S. Department of Labor. A geographical breakdown of unemployment figures for the states encompassing the three universities being studied is given below.

TABLE 1. LABOR FORCE AND UNEMPLOYMENT BY STATE AND SELECTED METROPOLITAN AREAS

| | Labor Force (Numbers in thousands) | | | Unemployment Number | | | Unemployment Percentage of Labor Force | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | D79 | N80 | D80p | D79 | N80 | D80p | D79 | N80 | D80p |
| Florida | 3,763.7 | 3,978.0 | 3,967.4 | 194.3 | 217.5 | 199.4 | 5.2 | 5.5 | 5.0 |
| Indiana | 2,648.2 | 2,589.0 | 2,588.9 | 204.0 | 215.6 | 224.5 | 7.7 | 8.3 | 8.7 |
| Minnesota | 2,078.7 | 2,111.7 | 2,124.8 | 101.6 | 123.1 | 139.2 | 4.9 | 5.8 | 6.6 |

D = December
N = November
p = preliminary figure

From these figures, only Indiana is above the national average in unemployment. A look at employment trends was provided by both state and community surrounding

the three universities. When figures for employees on nonagricultural payroll were gathered, both Indiana and Minnesota showed decreases in state employment rates.

TABLE 2. EMPLOYEES ON NONAGRICULTURAL PAYROLLS FOR STATES AND SELECTED AREAS

| City and State (In Thousands) | Dec. 1979 | Nov. 1980 | Dec. 1980 p. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Gainsville | 65.0 | 64.4 | 64.8 |
| Florida | 3503.5 | 3585.1 | 3623.6 |
| Indianapolis | 546.1 | 546.8 | 545.7 |
| Indiana | 2262.6 | 2244.6 | 2239.4 |
| M'pls/St. Paul | 1102.6 | 1100.6 | 1100.4 |
| Minnesota | 1807.4 | 1790.2 | 1784.9 |

p = preliminary

When community figures for those on payrolls were gathered, a slight decline over the year's period was noted for Gainsville and Indianapolis. The Twin City area of Minneapolis-St. Paul suffered an even greater reduction in those on payroll. It should be noted that figures for Bloomington, Indiana, were not available. Figures for Indianapolis, located fifty miles away from the main campus of Indiana University, were used as the best comparable data. Indianapolis is also the location of a large regional campus for Indiana University.

It was apparent that both the national and regional unemployment and employment information would not be encouraging to those searching for jobs. However, it was a premiseof this paper that availability of positions in the student personnel field would have more impact upon current employees than the national statistics. For that reason The Chronicle of Higher Education was surveyed for the past four years to establish the availability

of student personnel jobs. The sample used included only the large display notices and only those positions advertised which were under the supervision of the Vice President for Student Affairs. Display ads were used because they were more representative of jobs beyond the entry-level and therefore ones where current employees would be most likely to apply for employment. The actual count of these display ads is shown below.

TABLE 3. POSITIONS AVAILABLE AS ADVERTISED IN THE CHRONICLE

| Calendar Year | Count of Student Personnel Display Ads (N) |
|---|---|
| 1977 | 410 |
| 1978 | 659 |
| 1979 | 749 |
| 1980 | 1515 |

It became apparent that the number of positions being advertised in The Chronicle had grown each year. However, certain facts about The Chronicle should be taken into account when interpreting advertising volume. The Chronicle is relatively new as newspapers go. Beginning publication on November 23, 1966, the first edition had no employment ads. It was not until March 23, 1970, that the first job notice appeared. Very few ads actually were run in each edition during the early years. It was not until January 18, 1971, that the first border ad appeared. This issue contained a total of 21 ads. In 1972, the ad volume began to increase. The July 3, 1972, issue contained 97 job advertisements. With the passage of Title IX the month before (June, 1972), the advertising of positions became necessary for any institution holding federal government contracts. It is believed that the institutions' desire to comply with federal guidelines, resulted

in The Chronicle's job notices continuing to grow. As Socolow (1978) has demonstrated in his article, the positions advertised are not always viable opportunities. Often, he points out, jobs are advertised to meet government requirements, but parallel recruitment by the "old boy network" is actually filling the position.

Another source of job availability information is professional organizations. Three national organizations in the student personnel field were contacted for their placement service figures. The American College Personnel Association furnished the following information about their 1980 Convention held in Boston.

| | Candidates | Employers |
|---|---|---|
| Preregistered | 224 | 199 |
| On site Registration | 391 | 194 |
| Both Conventions (ACPA and APGA)* | 24 | 19 |
| Total | 639 | 412 |

*Persons who had registered their candidacy for employment at both ACPA and its parent organization, the American Personnel and Guidance Association.

These figures do not reflect the number of jobs per employer, but obviously there was at least one job per employer.

The National Association of Student Personnel Administrators furnished two year placement center figures.

| | Candidates | Employers | Positions |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1979 | 1127 | 400 | 740 |
| 1980 | 283 | 155 | 287 |

The greater number of positions available at the 1979 convention was believed to be attributable to the location of the convention in Washington, D.C. The following year, NASPA met in Los Angeles. Lower attendance is

usually experienced when professional groups meet in locations requiring greater travel distances. An official of NASPA also reported that the Housing area had the most listings. The Association of University and College Housing Officers supplied their figures for 1979 and 1980. Their job listing service began in only 1979 and has not reached the magnitude of the other two organizations. Candidate figures were not supplied. However, the service has grown from 73 job postings in 1979 to 107 postings in 1980. The majority of these jobs were reported to be entry-level positions.

While the number of employers and candidates fluctuates with the location of the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators convention, the ratio of jobsper employer remained the same both years. The average number of jobs listed was 1.8 per employer. The ratio of jobs available per candidate, however, decreased from 1979 to 1980 by 1.5 jobs to 1 job per candidate. It is difficult to tell if this is a result of location or economy. However, such a low ratio of jobs to candidates indicates that the convention job market was tight.

Faculty in Student Personnel training programs in all three universities were asked the status of candidates being admitted to the doctorate and masters programs in fields traditionally supplying student affairs personnel. They reported that doctorate candidates were experiencing fewer choices in securing positions than those graduating with master's degrees. Jobs for doctorate candidates are available, but were reported to be less in number than those for master's candidates. These training programs have either controlled enrollment or have cut-back in number of persons they are admitting to their doctoral programs.

It is a conflicting message being sent to prospective job seekers in the student personnel field. For those considering leaving the field the high national unemployment rate and a declining number being employed might

be discouraging. On the other hand, the increasing number of jobs advertised in The Chronicle could be encouraging if the potential candidate does not realize the pattern of growth may be attributable to a newspaper coming of age and a law that requires surface compliance. To the prospective job seeker with a master's degree, the range of possibilities for job change are greater than for those with doctorates requiring greater salaries. On the other hand, fewer persons being admitted to the program may be viewed as a lack of competition by those currently employed. There is no doubt that the job economy affects everyone to some degree. However, depending upon the perceptions of each employee, the job picture changes.

Variables Affecting Desire for Career Enrichment

With the job market so unpredictable, the other measures of conditions which might influence a need for career enrichment became even more important. Were there variables which would influence a subjects desire to try career enrichment programs? There were six variables tested which were hypothesized to act as either positive or negative insulators to an employee's desire to try career enrichment programs. As defined earlier, an insulator is a variable which alters the impact of the environment. The six insulators tested were age; departmental budget restrictions; transferable job skills; length of employment; geographical restrictions; salary restrictions. Only one of the six variables proved to affect an employee's desire for career enrichment. Length of time in current position was a strong influence upon responses. The length of time in current job influenced responses concerning preference for a more intellectually demanding job; the type of work planned in five years; underemployment in current job; choice of job; and change in occupation.

Preference for a more intellectually demanding job was strongly favored by those employed six to ten years in the same job. On the other hand, the

majority of those employed from 11 to 21 plus years did not prefer any more intellectual demands from their jobs. The responses from those employed two years or less were more variable. While these respondents moved into the direction of seeking more intellectual demanding jobs, the data proved to be more dichotomized in this time span. Uncertainty in response was its strongest in the three to five year span. Thirty percent of the respondents employed three to five years answered in the "uncertain" category.

TABLE 4. RELATIONSHIP PREFERENCE FOR A MORE INTELLECTUALLY DEMANDING JOB TO LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT IN CURRENT POSITION

| Would you Prefer a More Intellectually Demanding Job? | Length of Employment in Current Job | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2 yrs. or less | 3-5 | 6-10 | 11-15 | 16-21+ |
| Yes, Definitely | 13.0 | 17.0 | 17.6 | 16.7 | 14.3 |
| Yes, Probably | 36.2 | 25.5 | 44.1 | 22.2 | 21.4 |
| Uncertain | 17.4 | 29.8 | 20.6 | 11.1 | 0 |
| No, Probably | 24.6 | 21.3 | 8.8 | 38.9 | 42.9 |
| No, Definitely | 8.7 | 6.4 | 8.8 | 11.1 | 21.4 |
| Total percentage of persons in each category | 37.9 | 25.8 | 18.7 | 9.9 | 7.7 |

Degrees of Freedom: 16
Chi Square Value: .2122
Contingency Coefficient: .31593

Length of employment in their current job also affected future plans of employees. Forty percent of those employed six to ten years indicated that they did not plan to be in the same type of work in five years. Those

employed from 11 to 21 years in the same job showed the other extreme. The majority of these employees do plan to remain. Again those employed three to five years expressed uncertainty about their plans. They were joined this time in their responses by those employed two or fewer years. Thirty-eight percent of the three to five year category and 37 percent of the two or less years category answered they were uncertain about where they would be in five years.

TABLE 5. RELATIONSHIP OF PLANS TO BE IN THE SAME TYPE OF WORK IN FIVE YEARS TO LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT IN CURRENT JOB

| Plans for Same Type of Work in Five Years | Length of Employment in Current Job | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2 yrs. or less | 3-5 | 6-10 | 11-15 | 16-21+ |
| Yes, Definitely | 8.8 | 4.3 | 8.6 | 22.2 | 0 |
| Yes, Probably | 16.2 | 27.7 | 22.9 | 38.9 | 50.0 |
| Uncertain | 36.8 | 38.3 | 28.6 | 22.2 | 28.6 |
| No, Probably | 19.1 | 14.9 | 31.4 | 16.7 | 0 |
| No, Definitely | 19.1 | 14.9 | 8.6 | 0 | 21.4 |
| Total percentage of persons in each category | 37.4 | 25.8 | 19.2 | 9.9 | 7.7 |

Degrees of Freedom: 16
Chi Square Value: .0524
Contingency Coefficient: .35427

Length of employment in current job also effected how employees viewed the issue of underemployment. Underemployment in the current job was viewed by those employed six to ten years as a problem. Sixty percent of the respondents indicated they wanted a challenge with another 17 percent saying they were underemployed but couldn't change their jobs. For those employed 16 to 21 years, 50 percent said they were not underemployed. This is the only category where a combination of "yes" answers did not out-weigh the "no's".

TABLE 6: UNDEREMPLOYMENT IN CURRENT JOB TO LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT IN CURRENT JOB

| Underemployed in Current Job | Length of Employment in Current Job | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2 years or less | 3-5 | 6-10 | 11-15 | 16-21+ |
| Yes, Want Challenge | 36.8 | 35.6 | 60.0 | 38.9 | 21.4 |
| Yes, but Can't Change | 17.6 | 26.7 | 17.1 | 16.7 | 28.6 |
| No | 45.6 | 37.8 | 22.9 | 44.4 | 50.0 |
| Total percentage of persons in each category | 37.8 | 25.0 | 19.4 | 10.0 | 7.8 |

Degrees of Freedom: 8
Chi Square Value: .2247
Contingency Coefficient: .23595

When respondents made a choice of their current job, another job in the same field, or a job in another field, distinctions by years employed were readily apparent. Those employees in the same job from six to ten years preferred a job in another field. The 11 to 15 and 16 to 21 years categories both selected their current jobs. Those employed three to five and two or less years both opted for another job in the same field.

TABLE 7. RELATIONSHIP OF JOB CHOICE AND LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT IN CURRENT JOB

| Job Choice | Length of Employment in Current Job | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2 yrs. or less | 3-5 | 6-10 | 11-15 | 16-21+ |
| Current Job | 29.4 | 26.7 | 26.5 | 55.6 | 57.1 |
| Same Field | 36.8 | 40.0 | 32.4 | 16.7 | 21.4 |
| Another Field | 33.8 | 33.3 | 41.2 | 27.8 | 21.4 |
| Total percentage of persons in each category | 38.0 | 25.1 | 19.1 | 10.1 | 7.8 |

Degrees of Freedom: 8
Chi Square Value: .2122
Contingency Coefficient: .23874

"Would you consider changing occupations?" The frequency tabulations show that 63 percent of combined "yes" answers indicated they would consider a change. When these responses were correlated to length of employment in current job some obvious distinctions appeared. The greater the years on the job, the less inclined subjects are to change. The converse also held true. The fewer years on the job, the more willing were the subjects to consider change. There was one exception to these statements. For those employed three to five years, uncertainty was expressed in their answers. Twenty-eight percent said they were "uncertain". This figure was large enough to distort the direction of both the yes and no answers for this group.

TABLE 8. RELATIONSHIP OF A CONSIDERED CHANGE IN OCCUPATION AND LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT IN CURRENT JOB

| Change in Occupations | Length of Employment in Current Job | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2 years or less | 3-5 | 6-10 | 11-15 | 16-21+ |
| Yes, Definitely | 32.4 | 17.0 | 31.4 | 17.6 | 14.3 |
| Yes, Probably | 42.6 | 38.3 | 34.3 | 35.3 | 21.4 |
| Uncertain | 4.4 | 27.7 | 11.4 | 5.9 | 7.1 |
| No, Probably | 14.7 | 14.9 | 17.1 | 29.4 | 28.6 |
| No, Definitely | 5.9 | 2.1 | 5.7 | 11.8 | 28.6 |
| Total percentage of persons in each category | 37.6 | 26.0 | 19.3 | 9.4 | 7.7 |

Degrees of Freedom: 16
Chi Square Value: .0065
Contingency Coefficient: .39477

Employee Perceptions of Job Mobility

Length of employment in current job was shown to be a major influence upon employee's perceptions of their current job conditions and future job plans. Would the perceptions of employees about their job mobility be an

influencing factor in their desire for career enrichment? Employee perceptions of their mobility were analyzed.

The frequency data indicates that student personnel employees would consider a wide variety of changes in their employment (see Appendix A). When crosstabulations by university were made, only three items were not significant. This indicated that responses for these three items were not influenced by the place of employment. The items were: future employment in a small college town; family likes in changing job; and transferring to another job in student affairs at the employee's university. Fifty-six percent of the total respondents indicated that they would consider small college town employment. "Would your family like you to change your job?" Fourteen subjects failed to answer this question. This is the largest number of respondents who failed to answer any item. This figure is perhaps both a reflection of those who have no families and those who did not wish to deal with the question. Of those who did, 30 percent were uncertain what their family would want, and 34 percent answered that their families probably would not want them to change jobs. Fifty-four percent of the subjects responded they they would consider transferring to another job in student affairs. The remaining items used to analyze perceptions of mobility were related to where the subject was employed. However, all item responses were in the direction of considering change with the exception of the previously discussed "family likes," and the salary question which asked if the respondent believed a cut in salary would be necessary to change employment. While a strong majority of the subjects responded that they did not believe that a cut would be necessary, it was Indiana University and University of Florida employees who appeared to think a cut is less likely.

TABLE 9. RELATIONSHIP OF NECESSITY OF CUT IN PAY TO CHANGE JOB BY INSTITUTION

| Is a Cut in Pay Necessary to Change Jobs? | Minnesota | Florida | Indiana |
|---|---|---|---|
| Yes, Definitely and Probably | 17.8 | 6.4 | 0 |
| Uncertain | 20.8 | 8.5 | 2.9 |
| No, Probably | 34.7 | 38.3 | 28.6 |
| No, Definitely | 26.7 | 46.8 | 68.6 |
| Total percentage of persons in each university | 55.2 | 25.7 | 19.1 |

Degrees of Freedom: 6
Chi Square Value: .0001
Contingency Coefficient: .36804

The largest percentage (57.1%) of those making below $15,000 per year were employed at Indiana University. The University of Florida, employing 49 percent persons below $15,000, also produced a strong "definite no" response as recorded in Table 9. Those making the lowest salaries apparently believed that changing jobs could only better their financial situation. This supposition is borne out of a larger proportion of "yes" and "uncertain" responses from Minnesota employees where base salaries were greater.[1] Such a strong response from Indiana and Florida employees is explained when salaries are compared between universities.

[1]Base salaries reflect cost of living differences in geographical sections of the country. Minneapolis as compared to 31 other geographical areas has the eighth greatest cost of living in the United States.

TABLE 10. RELATIONSHIP OF SALARY TO INSTITUTION

| Salary | Minnesota | Florida | Indiana |
|---|---|---|---|
| $ 5,000 - 14,999 | 9.9 | 48.9 | 57.1 |
| 15,000 - 19,999 | 29.7 | 27.7 | 25.7 |
| 20,000 - 24,999 | 34.7 | 19.1 | 8.6 |
| 25,000 - 29,999 | 17.8 | 4.3 | 2.9 |
| 30,000 - 40,000+ | 7.9 | 0 | 5.7 |
| Total percentage of persons in each category | 55.2 | 25.7 | 19.1 |

Degrees of Freedom: 8
Chi Square Value: .0000
Contingency Coefficient: .45760

An analysis of employees' perceived ability to move is a contrast to the reality of what has occured. The chi square test of significance was run between "length of employment in the University" to "length of employment in current job." Actual percentage of job change was low. Table 11 shows that the majority of employees have spent their total employment in their current job.

TABLE 11. RELATIONSHIP OF LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT IN CURRENT POSITION TO LENGTH OF EMPLOYMENT AT UNIVERSITY

| | Length of Employment at University | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Current Position | 2 or less yrs. | 3-5 | 6-10 | 11-15 | 16-21+ |
| 2 yrs. or less | 97.6 | 39.5 | 12.8 | 14.8 | 4.2 |
| 3-5 yrs. | 0 | 60.5 | 38.3 | 7.4 | 4.2 |
| 6-10 yrs. | 2.4 | 0 | 48.9 | 29.6 | 12.5 |
| 11-15 yrs. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48.1 | 20.8 |
| 16-21 yrs. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58.3 |
| Total percentage of persons in each category | 23.0 | 23.5 | 25.7 | 14.8 | 13.1 |

Degrees of Freedom: 16
Chi Square Value: 0
Contingency Coefficient: .78185

This relationship does not say anything about the opportunity to change jobs. It does point out that a change has not happened very often. When subjects were asked if they had ever declined another job offer while employed at the university, 52 percent responded that they had. However, these responses do not tell how recently the job offer had been made. Several respondents took time to write in on this question that their offers came years ago.

Employees in all three institutions showed that they thought their potential for mobility existed. With only the one exception previously discussed, all responses were in the direction of considering change. Not only did they indicate that they would consider a wide variety of change, but the majority of the respondents did not believe they would have to sacrifice a cut in salary to make a change. Whether their beliefs were in touch with reality cannot be determined from these results. However, such positive commitments to consideration of changes indicates that the concept of career enrichment might be considered also. Career enrichment, defined as changing the job so that a person may demonstrate present skills, would appear to have a chance of being acceptable to employees.

Current Job Satisfaction

As predicted in Chapter III, the majority of employees liked their jobs. When the responses of those who "liked" their jobs were combined with those who "love" it, 88 percent would appear to have some degree of satisfaction with their current employment. There were 75 percent of the respondents who answered that they had seriously considered a change at sometime in their current job. Why they decided not to change cannot be determined from this study, but it is obvious that these 75 percent have

not made a move. A majority of 94 percent indicated that their opinions were typical of the way they usually feel about their jobs.

## Opportunity for Professional Development

For the purposes of this paper a distinction was made between programs which aid personal development and those which aid career enrichment. Of the seven job related programs presented in the questionnaire, four were classified as being promoters of personal development and three were classified as encouraging career enrichment. Academic classes, professional conventions, staff development presentations and community workshops were all classified as a method to promote personal development. These programs allow an employee to improve individual skills, knowledge, performance or productivity so that a change in job functions or a higher level of responsibility can be obtained. On the other hand, sabbaticals, exchange programs with other institutions, and job rotations within an institution allow the job functions or level of responsibilities to change so that an individual may demonstrate present skills, knowledge, performance or productivity. Methods of promoting personal development changes the individual; methods of encouraging career enrichment changes the job.

The data showed a clear distinction between personal development type of programs and those of career enrichment in the amount of opportunity afforded the subjects. The frequency data of "no opportunity" for participation in programs are shown in Table 12.

TABLE 12. FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYEES WITH NO OPPORTUNITY TO PARTICIPATE IN PROGRAMS

| Program | Frequency Number | Percentage of Total Group N = 183 |
|---|---|---|
| Classes | 34 | 18.6 |
| Conventions | 24 | 13.1 |
| Staff Development | 15 | 8.2 |
| Workshops | 73 | 39.9 |
| Sabbaticals | 160 | 87.4 |
| Job Rotations | 171 | 93.4 |
| Exchanges | 166 | 90.7 |

Clearly there is little opportunity for participation in career enrichment programs. It remained to be determined if there was a need on the part of student personnel employees to have such opportunities. To determine this need, subjects were asked to indicate programs in which they had not participated that they would like to try.

As shown below, approximately one-third of the subjects indicated that they would like to try career enrichment type programs. Table 13 shows the frequency distribution for those who would like to try all types of programs.

TABLE 13. PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS WHO WOULD "LIKE TO TRY" PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS BY TYPE OF PROGRAM

| Program Type | Frequency Number | Percentage of Those Responding |
|---|---|---|
| Classes | 43 | 23.5 |
| Conventions | 21 | 11.5 |
| Staff Development | 8 | 4.4 |
| Workshops | 21 | 11.5 |
| Sabbaticals | 54 | 29.5 |
| Job Rotations | 57 | 31.1 |
| Exchanges | 65 | 35.5 |

It was demonstrated that subjects had greater preferences for the career enrichment type programs. While lower frequencies in Table 13 may have resulted due to the wording of the question, one-third of the subjects still indicated a desire to try career enrichment programs. Because of the high percent of subjects indicating a desire to try these type programs, preferences by institution were analyzed.

Consistancy of preferences between institutions, for career enrichment type programs were still indicated. There was one exception in the data. More Florida respondents answered they would like to try classes than would like to try sabbaticals. Table 14 below shows preferences of respondents by institution.

TABLE 14. INSTITUTIONAL PREFERENCE FOR PROGRAMS BY TYPE OF PROGRAM

| Program Type | Minnesota | Florida | Indiana |
|---|---|---|---|
| Classes | 24.8 | 36.2 | 5.7 |
| Conventions | 13.9 | 10.6 | 5.7 |
| Staff Development | 4.0 | 6.4 | 2.9 |
| Workshops | 11.9 | 6.4 | 17.1 |
| Sabbaticals | 32.7 | 19.1 | 34.3 |
| Job Rotations | 28.7 | 25.5 | 45.7 |
| Exchanges | 36.6 | 36.2 | 31.4 |

The data indicated that when opportunity is present there has been participation. Table 15 on the following page shows the percentage of respondents by who have participated in all professional development programs.

TABLE 15. PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS BY INSTITUTION WHO HAVE PARTICIPATED IN TYPE OF PROGRAM

| Program Type | N | Minnesota | Florida | Indiana |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Classes | 112 | 59.4 | 59.6 | 68.6 |
| Conventions | 157 | 84.2 | 89.4 | 85.7 |
| Staff Development | 163 | 91.1 | 83.0 | 91.4 |
| Workshops | 100 | 60.4 | 53.2 | 40.0 |
| Sabbaticals | 12 | 7.9 | 4.3 | 5.7 |
| Job Rotation | 10 | 5.9 | 6.4 | 2.9 |
| Exchange | 14 | 5.0 | 2.1 | 22.9 |

Clearly where opportunity exists student personnel workers have participated. Not only was opportunity a significant factor in a person's desire to participate but the data in Table 15 shows that opportunity effected actual participation. The personal development type of programs show heavy participation; the career enrichment ones do not.

Benefits of Professional Development

Student personnel employees view these programs in which they have participated as helping their job effectiveness (83%) more than advancing their careers (50%). Respondents were asked to state in open-ended questions how specific programs of career advancement and job effectiveness within the university had been helpful to them. Their responses are categorized in Table 16.

TABLE 16. PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS INDICATING HOW PROGRAMS HELPED CAREER ADVANCEMENT AND JOB EFFECTIVENESS

| Program Type | Helped Career Advancement | Helped Job Effectiveness |
|---|---|---|
| Professional Growth | 39.1 | 57.1 |
| Productivity | 10.9 | 6.8 |
| Promotion | 13.0 | .7 |
| Expand Career | 19.6 | 6.8 |
| Contacts | 25.0 | 6.1 |
| Help Others | 0 | 4.8 |
| Mental Health | 6.5 | 4.1 |
| Failed to Answer | 6.5 | 8.2 |
| Total Percent of Respondents | 120.6*<br>N = 92 | 94.6<br>N = 147 |

*Percentage totals to over 100% because of respondents who had more than one answer.

Employees have limited familiarity with similar programs outside the university setting which foster job effectiveness (19%) and career advancement (21%). However, a majority of these respondents who answered that they had knowledge of such programs were able to name the program. Departments in the three institutions have encouraged their employees to participate in programs by mainly offering them time-off from work (73%) and by paying partial expenses (60%). However, several subjects wrote in on this item that neither time or money was ever offered but was available if they asked. Institutional differences did exist. Verbal encouragement and travel budgets apparently are administered differently (see Appendix A). Giving time-off from work was a universal method of encouragement used among

all three institutions. Seventy-one percent responded that they had participated in programs where time-off was given.

A chi square test of significance was run to determine whether those respondents opting to try career enrichment type programs also opted for specific workshops. No significant data resulted. The frequencies provided in Appendix A serve only as an indication of possible workshop interest for three institutions.

## Organizational Data About Departments

Department heads and coordinators within the Office of Student Affairs were interviewed in each of the three institutions (see Appendix E). The original intent of these interviews was to determine if budgetary restrictions were a problem, to determine a turn-over rate of employees, and to establish if there were staff development programs currently in existance. Lack of budgetary restrictions were hypothesised to act as an insulator against desire for career enrichment programs. When no significant difference was found between departments and desire for career enrichment programs, budgetary information no longer became necessary and was dropped from the interview. As shown earlier in this paper, the majority of personnel have been in their current job five years or less (see Appendix A). Data gathered from interviews indicated that the majority of change in personnel was by hiring new employees. Of the total group of 209 subjects, directors indicated that there were 15 percent new staff for the current year, one percent that had retired, and nine percent that had been promoted. It should be stated that these department heads did not go to official records to supply their counts. It is possible that they could have overlooked or overestimated positions in their areas of responsibility. These department heads also were asked about whether they currently had staff development programs

and, if so, what type of topics had been covered. Half of the departments in the total group of three institutions have what they define as a staff development program. What is considered "staff development" ranges from a one-shot orientation session for peer counselors to a continuous organized program for professional workers. There is a broad definition of the meaning of the term "staff development." This all-encompassing definition could explain also the high percentage of participation by respondents in staff development presentations (see Appendix A). The frequency data indicates that over 90 percent of student personnel subjects have participated in staff development programs.

# CHAPTER V

## Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

This chapter summarizes the problem, the procedures used in the investigation, and the results. The conclusions presented were based upon those results and from the conclusions certain recommendations were made.

### Summary of the Problem, Procedures, and Results

The problem in this study was to determine if student personnel employees had need for career enrichment type programs in three state universities. The institutions studied were the University of Minnesota, University of Florida, and Indiana University. For purposes of this study, a distinction between career enrichment and personal development programs was made. Career enrichment programs change the job so a person's skills and abilities may be used; personal development programs change the person's skills so the employee may do a better job.

In order to determine whether a need existed for career enrichment, a questionnairewas used to survey the student personnel staffs in the three institutions. In addition department heads within the Office of Student Affairs in each of the three universities were interviewed to determine department turn-over in personnel and whether career enrichment programs were currently in existence.

Six variables were tested to see if they influenced subjects' choices for career enrichment. Of the six variables tested from the questionnaire, only one proved to be significant when the chi square test was applied. That variable was the length of time employed in the current position. Length of time in the current position played a critical role in respondents'

perceptions and attitudes towards their employment. Those employed from six to ten years in the same position showed preferences for a more intellectually demanding job, had a plan to change the type of work they were doing in five years, felt they were underemployed in their current jobs, would choose a job in another field, and would consider changing occupations.

Those employed from three to five years showed the greatest uncertainty in their responses of any group. They were uncertain about whether they wanted a more intellectually demanding job, uncertain about the type of work they would be doing in five years, and were uncertain if they would consider changing occupations. This uncertainty was reflected also by their option for another job in the same field. While change of jobs was preferred, changing of fields was not. The middle-ground option was selected.

Those employed 11 or more years were less interested in change. Respondents in this category did not prefer any more intellectual demands from their jobs, they planned to remain in their current jobs, they were not underemployed, they preferred their current jobs, and they would not consider changing their occupations. This group indicated preferences for the status quo.

Responses were more variable from those employed two or less years in their current jobs. Preferences were dichotomized about wanting a more intellectually demanding job, beliefs about underemployment, and choices of job. While uncertain about what type of work they would be doing in five years, they were the group who had the largest percentage considering a change of occupation.

For all employee groups, lack of opportunity for career enrichment programs was indicated. While personal development programs have been made available for student personnel employees, the majority of them have

not had the opportunity to try the career enrichment programs. Student personnel workers have heavily participated in the personal development programs where opportunity does exist. Approximately one-third of the sample responded that they would like to try career enrichment programs.

## Conclusions

The results indicated that a significant number of student personnel workers perceived a need for career enrichment programs. The opportunity for participation in these programs by employees is limited. Because employees in the past have availed themselves of the personal development type programs when the opportunity was present, there is reason to believe that they would also take advantage of career enrichment programs if these programs were offered.

The length of time employed in the current position was shown to be an influential variable. Of all the time spans, those employed six to ten years were the most viable candidates for career enrichment programs. Their responses were indicative of the "rust-out syndrome." Rust-out, as opposed to burn-out, is a feeling of being underemployed and unchallenged in the job. Burn-out is a feeling of having emotional resources exhausted. One is under-use; the other is over-use.

Those employees working in the current job from three to five years also are strong candidates for career enrichment programs. These persons expressed uncertainty in what they wanted from their employment and of their future job plans. Career enrichment programs would allow this group to make some determinations about job preferences.

As long as the majority of employees remain in their current jobs for the entire tenure of their employment, the need for career enrichment will continue. Should the job market fail to produce employment opportunities

for student personnel workers, this need will be accentuated as more employees remain in their current jobs. Those employed from six to ten years in their present positions will be the group most likely to avail themselves of an opportunity for career enrichment programs.

## Recommendations

1. Career enrichment programs should be offered to all student personnel employees on an optional basis. Those who wish to participate should be given the opportunity.
2. Personal development programs should continue to be offered as part of a professional development package.
3. When establishing career enrichment programs, those employed in their current jobs from six to ten years should be encouraged to participate. They are the group most likely to benefit from the program.
4. Future research with career enrichment programs should include the variable of "length of time in the current job." This variable did interact in the manner predicted.
5. It is recommended that the same study be conducted in other universities to observe if the variables interact in the same pattern.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Becker, S. Maybe, just maybe, it's time for you to quit! Training HRD, 1979, January, P. 78.

Blake, R., and Mouton, J. The Managerial Grid. Houston: Gulf Publishing Co., 1964.

Crowl, J. 100 institutions reported facing fiscal disaster. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 1971, 6 (1), P. 1.

Dawis, R. and Lofquist, L. Personality style and the process of work adjustment, Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1976, 23, 55-59.

Dawis, R. and Lofquist, L. A note on the dynamics of work adjustment, Journal of Vocational Behavior, 1978, 12, 76-79.

Employment and Earnings, U. S. Department of Labor, Washington: 28 (2), 1981.

Ford, R., Motivation Through the Work Itself. New York: American Management Association, 1969.

Ford, R., Why Jobs Die and What to Do About It, New York: Amacom, 1979.

Hallburg, E., The Gray Itch: The Male Metapause Syndrome. Los Angeles: Ombudsman Press, 1977.

Hampton, D., Contemporary Management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1977.

Herzberg, F., The Motivation to Work. New York: John Wiley and Son, Inc., 1959.

Herzberg, F., Work and the Nature of Man. Clevelend, N.Y.: World Publishing Co., 1966.

Hoppock, R., Job Satisfaction. New York: Harper and brothers, 1935.

Industrial Relations Center, Report of the Findings of the Employee Attitude Survey Conducted at the University of Minnesota, unpublished manuscript, University of Minnesota Wilson Library, 1979.

Johnson, George, To heck with inflation, it's time for a vacation, The Minneapolis Star, May 16, 1980.

Kerr, C., A judgment about enrollments, AGB Reports, 1980, 22 (May/June) 10-22.

Labovitz, S., Criteria for selecting a significant level: a note on the sacredness of .05, The American Sociologist, 3 (3) 1968.

Learning to Live on the Promotional Plateau, New York: The Research Institute of America, Inc., 1978.

LeVine, B., Abbott, M., and Barber, R. Assessment, interpretation and enrichment: resident adviser satisfaction and motivation. Paper presented at the meeting of the Association of College and University Housing Officers, Toronto, July, 1980.

Likert, R., New Patterns in Management. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961.

Magarrell, J., Freshman applications for next fall up 13 percent from 1980, survey finds, The Chronicle of Higher Education, 1981, 22 (2) P. 1.

Magarrell, J., Treat higher education as a business, college groups tell administration, The Chronicle of Higher Education, 1981, 22 (2) P. 1.

McGregor, D., The Human Side of Enterprise, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

McGregor, D., The Professional Manager, USA: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Maslow, A., Motivation and Personality, New York: New York Harper, 1954.

Nie, N., Hall, C., Jenkins, J., Steinbrenner, K., and Brent, D., Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Ritti, R. (Collected writings) In J. R. Maher (Ed.), New Perspectives in Job Enrichment. New York: Van Nostrand Reinbold Company, 1971.

Scanlon, L., Teacher 'burnout', The Minneapolis Star, April 7, 1980, P. 1.

Scanlon, L., Teachers 'shouldn't' give up - but they do, The Minneapolis Star, April 8, 1980, P. 1.

Scolow, D., How administrators get their jobs, Change, 1978, 10 (5) 42-54.

Semas, P., Market for jobs seen improving after this year, The Chronicle of Higher Education, 1971, 5(35) P. 1.

Skinner, B., Science and Human Behavior, New York: The Free Press, 1954.

Thorndike, The Psychology of Learning, New York: Columbia Teachers College, 1913.

Watson, J., Behaviorism, New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1924.

Yorks, L., A Radical Approach to Job Enrichment, New York: Amacom, 1976.

Yorks, L., Job Enrichment Revisited, New York: Amacom, 1979.

# APPENDIX A

# Professional Development Questionnaire

This study is about how you and other professional employees in the Student Affairs area perceive opportunities for career development. Answers to the demographic questions are important as control variables in the study. All answers are confidential and will be used only in combination with those of other respondents to form a composite picture. The number on this questionnaire is for follow-up purposes only. Please answer all questions directly on the form and return it as soon as possible in the enclosed self-addressed envelope.

SECTION I: Demographic Data (Check one answer in each item below.)

1. What is your highest academic degree?

| | | Mn | Fla | Ind |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Doctorate | 25.1 | 28.7 | 21.3 | 20.0 |
| Specialist | 4.4 | 39.6 | 42.6 | 74.3 |
| Masters | 42.6 | | | |
| Bachelors | 23.0 | 28.7 | 25.5 | 2.9 |
| Associate | 3.3 | 3.0 | 10.6 | 2.9 |
| High School | 1.6 | | | |

2. What was your age on your last birthday?

| | | Mn | Fla | Ind |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 20 - 30 years | 26.9 | 17.0 | 36.2 | 42.9 |
| 31 - 40 years | 41.8 | 45.0 | 36.2 | 40.0 |
| 41 - 50 years | 15.4 | 17.0 | 17.0 | 8.6 |
| 51 - 60 years | 13.2 | 21.0 | 10.6 | 8.6 |
| 61 - 70 years | 2.7 | | | |
| 71 - and over | - | | | |

3. What is your length of employment at the University?

| | | Mn | Fla | Ind |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 years or less | 23.0 | 17.8 | 29.8 | 28.6 |
| 3 - 5 years | 23.5 | 19.8 | 23.4 | 34.3 |
| 6 - 10 years | 25.7 | 26.7 | 25.5 | 22.9 |
| 11 - 15 years | 14.8 | 17.8 | 12.8 | 8.6 |
| 16 - 20 years | 6.0 | 17.8 | 8.5 | 5.7 |
| 21 or more years | 7.1 | | | |

4. What is your length of employment in your current position?

| | | Mn | Fla | Ind |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 years or less | 37.7 | 34.7 | 34.0 | 51.4 |
| 3 - 5 years | 25.7 | 22.8 | 21.9 | 25.7 |
| 6 - 10 years | 19.1 | 19.8 | 21.3 | 14.3 |
| 11 - 15 years | 9.8 | 11.9 | 6.4 | 8.6 |
| 16 - 20 years | 5.5 | 10.9 | 6.4 | - |
| 21 or more years | 2.2 | | | |

5. Are you female or male?

| | | Mn | Fla | Ind |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Female | 48.1 | 43.4 | 51.1 | 57.1 |
| Male | 51.9 | 56.6 | 48.9 | 42.9 |

6. What is your salary range?

| | | Mn | Fla | Ind |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| $ 5,000 - $ 9,999 | 1.1 | 9.9 | 48.9 | 57.1 |
| 10,000 - 14,999 | 27.9 | | | |
| 15,000 - 19,999 | 28.4 | 29.7 | 27.7 | 25.7 |
| 20,000 - 24,999 | 25.7 | 34.7 | 19.1 | 8.6 |
| 25,000 - 29,999 | 11.5 | 17.8 | 4.3 | 2.9 |
| 30,000 - 34,999 | 4.4 | 7.9 | - | 5.7 |
| 35,000 - 39,999 | - | | | |
| 40,000 - and over | 1.1 | | | |

7. What is your marital status?

| | | Mn | Fla | Ind |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Never married | 28.4 | 28.7 | 21.3 | 37.1 |
| Previously married | 14.8 | 13.9 | 19.1 | 11.4 |
| Currently married | 56.8 | 57.4 | 59.6 | 51.4 |

8. Do you have a spouse currently employed?

| | | Mn | Fla | Ind |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes, full-time | 37.4 | 37.8 | 36.2 | 38.2 |
| Yes, part-time | 11.7 | 8.2 | 19.1 | 11.8 |
| No | 50.8 | 54.1 | 44.7 | 50.0 |

9. Do you have school age children living with you?

| | | Mn | Fla | Ind |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes, full-time | 23.3 | 28.3 | 17.4 | 28.6 |
| Yes, part-time | 2.2 | | | |
| No | 74.4 | 71.7 | 82.6 | 71.4 |

10. Do you have pre-school children living with you?

| | | Mn | Fla | Ind |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes, full-time | 14.8 | 12.9 | 19.1 | 20.0 |
| Yes, part-time | 1.1 | | | |
| No | 84.2 | 87.1 | 80.9 | 80.0 |

11. Which is your area of employment in Student Affairs.

| | | Mn | Fla | Ind |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Activities/Unions/Fraternities/ Leadership/Orientation | 21.3 | 24.8 | 25.5 | 5.7 |
| Career Placement/Counseling/ Learning Skills | 20.8 | 19.8 | 23.4 | 20.0 |
| Central Administration/Research | 2.2 | 10.9 | 4.3 | 2.9 |
| Discipline/Drug Abuse/Legal Services/Judicial | 5.5 | | | |
| Financial Aids | 19.7 | 14.9 | 21.3 | 31.4 |
| Housing | 19.7 | 13.9 | 17.0 | 40.0 |
| International/Minority/Women/ Handicapped/Veterans | 10.9 | 15.8 | 8.5 | - |
| Other, (please specify) | - | | | |

12. Are you a full-time employee at the University?

| | | Mn | Fla | Ind |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes, I am employed full-time for nine months | 3.3 | 2.0 | 8.5 | - |
| Yes, I am employed full-time for ten months | 0.5 | - | - | 2.9 |
| Yes, I am employed full-time for twelve months | 96.2 | 98.0 | 91.5 | 97.1 |
| No | - | - | - | - |

SECTION II: Mobility Status (Circle one answer for each item.)

| | Definitely Yes | Probably Yes | Uncertain | Probably No | Definitely No | | Definitely Yes | Probably Yes | Uncertain | Probably No | Definitely No |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Would you consider employment in another state? | 33.5 | 27.5 | 14.3 | 17.0 | 7.7 | Mn | 25.0 | 29.0 | 20.0 | 17.0 | 9.0 |
| | | | | | | Fla | 38.3 | 19.1 | 10.6 | 21.3 | 10.6 |
| | | | | | | Ind | 51.4 | 34.3 | 2.9 | 11.4 | - |
| 2. Would you consider future employment in a metropolitan area? | 37.4 | 34.1 | 13.7 | 9.9 | 4.9 | Mn | 47.5 | 35.6 | 9.9 | 5.0 | 2.0 |
| | | | | | | Fla | 25.5 | 36.2 | 17.0 | 10.6 | 10.6 |
| | | | | | | Ind | 23.5 | 26.5 | 20.6 | 23.6 | 5.9 |
| 3. Would you consider future employment in a small "college town"? | 18.6 | 37.7 | 16.9 | 16.9 | 9.8 | Mn | 17.8 | 33.7 | 20.8 | 15.8 | 11.9 |
| | | | | | | Fla | 12.8 | 40.4 | 17.0 | 19.1 | 10.6 |
| | | | | | | Ind | 28.6 | 45.7 | 5.7 | 17.1 | 2.9 |
| 4. Would you consider employment other than at this University? | 53.8 | 30.8 | 7.1 | 6.6 | 1.6 | Mn | 51.5 | 34.7 | 6.9 | | |
| | | | | | | Fla | 51.1 | 23.4 | 12.8 | 12.8 | |
| | | | | | | Ind | 64.7 | 29.4 | - | 5.9 | |
| 5. Do you believe that it would be necessary for you to take a cut in salary in order to change employment? | 0.5 | 10.9 | 14.2 | 34.4 | 39.9 | Mn | 17.8 | | 20.8 | 34.7 | 26.7 |
| | | | | | | Fla | 6.4 | | 8.5 | 38.3 | 46.8 |
| | | | | | | Ind | - | | 2.9 | 28.6 | 68.6 |
| 6. Would you prefer a more intellectually demanding job? | 15.4 | 32.4 | 19.2 | 23.6 | 9.3 | Mn | 13.9 | 37.6 | 21.8 | 22.8 | 4.0 |
| | | | | | | Fla | 17.0 | 23.4 | 10.6 | 27.7 | 21.3 |
| | | | | | | Ind | 17.6 | 29.4 | 23.5 | 20.6 | 8.8 |
| 7. Would your family like you to change your job? | 11.2 | 15.4 | 30.2 | 33.7 | 9.5 | Mn | 9.4 | 15.6 | 34.4 | 32.3 | 8.3 |
| | | | | | | Fla | 16.3 | 11.6 | 25.6 | 37.2 | 9.3 |
| | | | | | | Ind | 10.0 | 20.0 | 23.3 | 33.3 | 13.3 |
| 8. Would you consider changing occupations? | 25.4 | 37.6 | 12.2 | 17.7 | 7.2 | Mn | 24.8 | 41.6 | 14.9 | 18.8 | |
| | | | | | | Fla | 21.3 | 38.3 | 10.6 | 29.8 | |
| | | | | | | Ind | 33.3 | 24.2 | 6.1 | 36.4 | |
| 9. Would you consider transferring to another job in Student Affairs at this University? | 21.3 | 32.8 | 20.8 | 18.0 | 7.1 | Mn | 17.8 | 35.6 | 24.8 | 21.8 | |
| | | | | | | Fla | 29.8 | 25.5 | 12.8 | 31.9 | |
| | | | | | | Ind | 20.0 | 34.3 | 20.0 | 25.7 | |
| 10. In five years do you plan to be in the same type of work? | 8.2 | 25.3 | 33.5 | 18.7 | 14.3 | Mn | 4.0 | 27.0 | 37.0 | 16.0 | 16.0 |
| | | | | | | Fla | 8.5 | 25.5 | 31.9 | 25.5 | 8.5 |
| | | | | | | Ind | 20.0 | 20.0 | 25.7 | 17.1 | 17.1 |

To what degree do you believe you skills would allow you to transfer to a new position:

11. In one or more departments within Student Affairs at this University? (Check one response.)

| | | Mn | Fla | Ind |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Transfer with no training | 18.8 | 16.2 | 23.4 | 20.0 |
| Transfer with minimum training | 65.2 | 64.6 | 66.0 | 65.7 |
| Transfer with six months training | 11.6 | 19.2 | 10.2 | 14.3 |
| Transfer with one year training | 4.4 | | | |

12. In the same department in another university or college? (Check one response.)

| | | Mn | Fla | Ind |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Transfer with no training | 42.9 | 32.0 | 55.3 | 57.1 |
| Training with minimum training | 45.6 | 53.0 | 38.3 | 34.3 |
| Transfer with six months training | 8.8 | 15.0 | 6.4 | 8.6 |
| Transfer with one year training | 2.7 | | | |

13. In a comparable job in a non-educational enterprise? (Check one response.)

| | | Mn | Fla | Ind |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Transfer with no training | 19.3 | 20.2 | 17.0 | 20.0 |
| Transfer with minimum training | 49.2 | 46.5 | 53.2 | 51.4 |
| Transfer with six months training | 26.0 | 33.3 | 29.8 | 28.6 |
| Transfer with one year training | 5.5 | | | |

SECTION III: Current Job Condition (Check one answer for each item.)

1. If you could have your choice of any job, anywhere, which would you choose?

| | | Mn | Fla | Ind |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| My current job | 33.0 | 31.3 | 37.8 | 31.4 |
| Another job in the same field | 33.5 | 31.3 | 31.1 | 42.9 |
| A job in another field | 33.5 | 37.4 | 31.1 | 25.7 |

2. Do you like your current job?

| | | Mn | Fla | Ind |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| I love it | 24.9 | 18.0 | 32.6 | 34.3 |
| I like it | 63.5 | 70.0 | 60.9 | 48.6 |
| I am indifferent to it | 8.8 | 8.0 | 6.5 | 14.3 |
| I don't like it | 1.7 | 3.0 | - | - |
| I hate it | 1.1 | 1.0 | - | 2.9 |

3. Have you declined another job offer while employed at the University?

| | | Mn | Fla | Ind |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 51.9 | 51.5 | 57.4 | 45.7 |
| No | 48.1 | 48.5 | 42.6 | 54.3 |

4. Have you ever seriously considered changing your current job?

| | | Mn | Fla | Ind |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 74.9 | 76.2 | 76.6 | 68.6 |
| No | 25.1 | 23.8 | 23.4 | 31.4 |

5. Do you believe with your skills, education and experience that you are underemployed in your current job?

| | | Mn | Fla | Ind |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes, I am ready for a more challenging job | 40.0 | 40.8 | 40.4 | 37.1 |
| Yes, but I do not want to change jobs for personal reasons | 20.6 | 21.4 | 17.0 | 22.9 |
| No | 39.4 | 37.8 | 42.6 | 40.0 |

6. Are your opinions today typical of the way you usually feel about your job?

| | | Mn | Fla | Ind |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 93.9 | 93.9 | 95.7 | 91.4 |
| No | 6.1 | 6.1 | 4.3 | 8.6 |

SECTION IV: Professional Opportunities

1. Since taking your current position, have you participated in any of the following programs pertaining to your job? Check all that apply and list other programs if job related.

| | | Mn | Fla | Ind |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| academic classes | 61.2 | 59.4 | 59.6 | 68.6 |
| professional conventions | 85.8 | 84.2 | 89.4 | 85.7 |
| staff development presentations | 89.1 | 91.1 | 83.0 | 91.4 |
| community workshops | 54.6 | 60.4 | 53.2 | 40.0 |
| sabbaticals | 6.6 | 7.9 | 4.3 | 5.7 |
| job rotation (swap) within institution | 5.5 | 5.9 | 6.4 | 2.9 |
| exchange programs with other institutions | 7.7 | 5.0 | 2.1 | 22.9 |
| other | 14.8 | | | |

2. Have any of the above programs in which you participated helped you in your career advancement?

| | | Mn | Fla | Ind |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 50.0 | 52.5 | 50.0 | 42.9 |
| No | 46.7 | 44.4 | 43.5 | 57.1 |
| Have not participated | 3.3 | 3.0 | 6.5 | - |

3. If you answered *yes* to question #2, name the program and state in what way the program helped you.

| | | Mn | Fla | Ind |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| professional growth | 39.1 | 40.4 | 37.5 | 37.5 |
| productivity | 10.9 | 19.2 | - | - |
| promotion | 13.0 | 13.5 | 16.7 | 6.3 |
| mental helath | 6.5 | 9.6 | 4.2 | - |
| expand career | 19.6 | 23.1 | 12.5 | 18.8 |
| contacts | 25.0 | 21.2 | 25.0 | 37.5 |
| named program | 65.2 | 57.7 | 75.0 | 75.0 |
| failed to answer | 6.5 | 5.8 | 12.5 | - |

4. Have any of the programs in which you participated helped you in your job effectiveness?

| | | Mn | Fla | Ind |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 83.1 | 84.5 | 80.4 | 82.9 |
| No | 14.1 | 14.4 | 10.9 | 17.1 |
| Have not participated | 2.8 | 1.0 | 8.7 | - |

5. If you answered *yes* to question #4, name the program and state in what way the program helped you.

| | | Mn | Fla | Ind |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| professional growth | 57.1 | 50.6 | 59.5 | 72.4 |
| productivity | 6.8 | 6.2 | 8.1 | 6.9 |
| help others | 4.8 | 6.2 | 2.7 | 3.4 |
| promotion | .7 | 1.2 | - | - |
| expand career | 6.8 | 11.1 | - | 3.4 |
| mental health | 4.1 | 6.2 | 2.7 | - |
| contacts | 6.1 | 7.4 | 5.4 | 3.4 |
| named program | 60.5 | 50.6 | 73.0 | 72.4 |
| failed to answer | 8.2 | 8.6 | 5.4 | 10.3 |

6. Do you know of any career advancement program(s) offered *outside* the University that might be helpful to Student Affairs personnel?

| | | Mn | Fla | Ind |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 21.0 | 25.0 | 13.3 | 20.0 |
| No | 79.0 | 75.0 | 86.7 | 80.0 |

7. If you answered *yes* in #6, please specify the program by title and sponsor.

| | | Mn | Fla | Ind |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Named the program | 89.2 | 91.7 | 100.0 | 71.4 |
| Failed to answer | 10.8 | 8.3 | - | 28.6 |

8. Do you know of any job effectiveness program(s) offered *outside* the University that might be useful to Student Affairs personnel?

| | | Mn | Fla | Ind |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 18.7 | 19.8 | 15.6 | 20.0 |
| No | 81.3 | 80.2 | 84.4 | 80.0 |

9. If you answered *yes* in #8, please specify the program by title and sponsor.

| | | Mn | Fla | Ind |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Named the program | 78.8 | 83.3 | 87.5 | 57.1 |
| Failed to answer | 21.2 | 16.7 | 12.5 | 42.9 |

10. Does your job currently give you the opportunity to participate in any of the following programs? List other programs if job related.

| | | Mn | Fla | Ind |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| academic classes | 81.4 | 81.2 | 78.7 | 85.7 |
| professional conventions | 86.9 | 82.2 | 91.5 | 94.3 |
| staff development presentations | 91.8 | 91.1 | 91.5 | 94.3 |
| community workshops | 60.1 | 59.4 | 63.8 | 57.1 |
| sabbaticals | 12.6 | 14.9 | 10.6 | 8.6 |
| job rotation (swap) within institution | 6.6 | 8.9 | 6.4 | - |
| exchange programs with other institutions | 9.3 | 7.9 | 6.4 | 17.1 |
| other | 7.1 | | | |

11. Has your department encouraged you to participate in programs listed above by any of the following methods? Check all that apply.

| | | Mn | Fla | Ind |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Offering you time-off from work | 73.2 | 72.3 | 70.2 | 80.0 |
| Offering to pay full expenses | 42.1 | 52.5 | 40.4 | 14.3 |
| Offering to pay partial expenses | 59.6 | 54.5 | 70.2 | 60.0 |
| Discussing with you the importance of the program | 37.7 | 35.6 | 27.7 | 57.1 |

12. Have you participated in any of the programs listed in #10 where you were *not* awarded time-off from your work?

| | | Mn | Fla | Ind |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 28.9 | 25.0 | 37.0 | 29.4 |
| No | 71.1 | 75.0 | 63.0 | 70.6 |

13. Have you participated in any of the programs listed in #10 where you were *not* awarded fully-paid expenses by your department?

| | | Mn | Fla | Ind |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 63.7 | 60.6 | 50.0 | 91.2 |
| No | 36.3 | 39.4 | 50.0 | 8.8 |

14. If you answered *yes* in either #12 or #13 please list the *type* of program in which you participated and state *why* you participated

| | | Mn | Fla | Ind |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| professional growth | 38.8 | 33.3 | 52.0 | 38.7 |
| productivity | 6.9 | 8.3 | 8.0 | 3.2 |
| helps others | 1.7 | 3.3 | - | - |
| promotion | .9 | - | 4.0 | - |
| expand career | 7.8 | 8.3 | 4.0 | 9.7 |
| mental health | 2.6 | 3.3 | - | 3.2 |
| contacts | 9.5 | 8.3 | 20.0 | 3.2 |
| named program | 81.0 | 73.7 | 80.0 | 96.8 |
| failed to answer | 3.2 | 5.0 | 20.0 | 3.2 |

15. Since taking your current job are there job related programs listed below in which you have *not* participated that you would like to try? Check all that apply and list additional job related programs where appropriate.

| | | Mn | Fla | Ind |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| academic classes | 23.5 | 23.8 | 36.2 | 5.7 |
| professional conventions | 11.5 | 13.9 | 10.6 | 5.7 |
| staff development presentations | 4.4 | 4.0 | 6.4 | 2.9 |
| community workshops | 11.5 | 11.9 | 6.4 | 17.1 |
| sabbaticals | 29.5 | 32.7 | 19.1 | 34.3 |
| job rotation (swap) within institution | 31.1 | 28.7 | 25.5 | 45.7 |
| exchange programs with other institutions | 35.5 | 31.6 | 36.2 | 31.4 |
| other | 2.7 | | | |

16. If you indicated any program(s) in #15, please state *why* you want to participate in the program(s).

| | | Mn | Fla | Ind |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| professional growth | 66.4 | 63.8 | 79.4 | 52.6 |
| expand career | 13.9 | 8.7 | 20.6 | 21.1 |
| mental health | 15.6 | 20.3 | 5.9 | 15.8 |
| productivity | 12.3 | 15.9 | 5.9 | 10.5 |
| contacts | 5.7 | 2.9 | 8.8 | 10.5 |
| promotion | 2.5 | 1.4 | 2.9 | 5.3 |
| program named | 7.4 | 5.8 | 5.9 | 15.8 |
| failed to answer | 10.7 | 14.5 | - | 15.8 |

17. Would you be interested in participating in workshops on the following topics? Check all topics in which you are interested and list others which you feel would contribute to either your advancement or job effectiveness.

| | | Mn | Fla | Ind |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Building Job Contacts | 34.4 | 31.7 | 36.2 | 40.0 |
| Analyzing Power Structures | 35.0 | 26.7 | 42.6 | 48.6 |
| Recognizing Job Potential | 38.8 | 35.6 | 31.9 | 57.1 |
| Analyzing Work Loads | 38.8 | 37.6 | 40.4 | 40.0 |
| Improving Office Morale | 43.7 | 38.6 | 42.6 | 60.0 |
| Economic Forecasting | 27.3 | 20.8 | 29.8 | 42.9 |
| Career Planning | 33.3 | 32.7 | 27.7 | 42.9 |
| Resume Writing | 16.9 | 16.8 | 21.3 | 11.4 |
| Budget Analyses | 36.1 | 27.7 | 48.9 | 42.9 |
| Legal Issues | 31.7 | 26.7 | 34.0 | 42.9 |
| Time Management | 28.4 | 29.7 | 27.7 | 25.7 |
| Stress Management | 36.1 | 32.7 | 40.4 | 40.0 |
| Listening Skills | 35.5 | 39.6 | 29.8 | 31.4 |
| Communication Skills | 38.8 | 39.6 | 31.9 | 45.7 |
| Leadership Strategies | 45.9 | 45.5 | 46.8 | 45.7 |
| Other | 10.9 | | | |

# APPENDIX B

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs
Morrill Hall
100 Church Street S.E.
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

December 1, 1980

Dear OSA Staff Member:

Your assistance is needed in a project to help the Office of Student Affairs. I am asking that you complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it as soon as possible in the envelope provided (no postage required).

The questionnaire is part of a research project encompassing three major universities. Dr. Betty Roe, from the University of Minnesota, is directing the study. Its purpose is to determine how professional employees in the Office of Student Affairs perceive their opportunities for career development and to determine whether a need for additional opportunities exists. Your input, as an active member of the profession, is necessary for the project to be successful. We at the University of Minnesota will benefit from the study by obtaining information about our own professional needs and by being able to receive comparable data from other universities.

Please be assured that your responses will be kept in complete confidence. The number on your survey form will be used only for follow-up purposes and at no time will your name be identified with your responses. The survey results will be reported only in summary form and will never identify the participants. The questionnaire will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. I hope that you will answer and return it within the next week. Please accept my thanks for your assistance.

Sincerely yours,

Frank B. Wilderson, Jr.

Frank B. Wilderson, Jr.
Vice President for Student Affairs

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA
GAINESVILLE, 32611

VICE PRESIDENT FOR
STUDENT AFFAIRS

123 TIGERT HALL
904/392-1265

November 26, 1980

Dear University of Florida Student Affairs Staff Member:

Your assistance is needed in a project to help the Office of Student Affairs. I am asking that you complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it as soon as possible in the envelope provided (no postage required).

The questionnaire is part of a research project encompassing three major universities. Dr. Betty Roe, from the University of Minnesota, is directing the study. Its purpose is to determine how professional employees in the Office of Student Affairs perceive their opportunities for career development and to determine whether a need for additional opportunities exists. Your input, as an active member of the profession, is necessary for the project to be successful. We at the University of Florida will benefit from the study by obtaining information about our own professional needs and by being able to receive comparable data from other universities.

Please be assured that your responses will be kept in complete confidence. The number on your survey form will be used only for follow-up purposes and at no time will your name be identified with your responses. The survey results will be reported only in summary form and will never identify the participants. The questionnaire will take approximately fifteen minutes to complete. I hope that you will answer and return it within the next week. Please accept my thanks for your assistance.

Sincerely yours,

Arthur Sandeen
Vice President for Student Affairs



EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY/AFFIRMATIVE ACTION EMPLOYER

# APPENDIX C

I don't
just send out
questionnaires

Happy Holiday

Greetings

Betty Roe

I don't
just send out
questionnaires

Happy New Year

Betty Roe

Betty Roe
2737 SALEM AVE. SO., ST. LOUIS PARK, MINNESOTA 55416



January 12, 1981

Dear Colleague:

Recently you received a Professional Development Questionnaire and a letter urging you to complete the form and return it. I realize in the fast-paced days before the holidays that you easily might have misplaced it. Therefore, I am enclosing another one for your use. You will notice that there is also a return self-addressed envelope.

If you have already returned the questionnaire, please accept my thanks. If you have not yet submitted the form, I would greatly appreciate your prompt completion of the questionnaire and returning it. Your professional responses are needed for the study to be complete.

Sincerely yours,

Betty Roe

Betty Roe

Enclosures (2)

# APPENDIX D

Institution_____ Department_____

1. How many persons are in your total supervision?

   #_____ (exact)

   (don't know) est. #_____

2. Do any of those hold faculty rank?
   yes_____ how many?_____
   no_____

3. Do you hold academic rank?
   yes_____
   no_____

4. Of the total personnel in your supervision, how many are "civil service"?
   #_____
   other title:_____

5. Do any employees under your supervision belong to a Labor Union?
   No_____
   Yes_____ #_____ Name_____

6. HAND LIST

   This is a list of programs in which it may be possible for some student personnel workers to participate. Do you have staff currently involved (or soon to be participating) in any of these programs?

   in ALL programs_____
   in None _____
   in Specific programs_____
   _____
   _____
   _____

7. Are there other programs not listed in which you have staff participating?

   _____
   _____
   _____

8. How do you encourage your staff to participate?

   _____
   _____
   _____

9. Do you have any new student personnel staff for this year?
   no_____
   yes_____ #_____

10. Didyou have any retirees at the end of last year or during the current academic year?
    no_____
    yes_____ #_____

11. Have you had any personnel promoted or reclassified for this current year?
    no_____
    yes_____ #_____

12. When did the last promotion or reclassification occur on your staff?

13. Do you have an in-staff training program for professional development?
    yes_____
    no_____

14. If YES, what topic areas have been presented?

    _____
    _____
    _____

15. What need, as you see it, do the programs serve?

    _____
    _____

16. What are you doing for your own professional development?

    _____
    _____

17. What encouragement do you receive for participating in #16?

    _____
    _____

# APPENDIX E

Those in charge of the following university units were included in the interviews:

University of Florida
- Financial Aids
- Housing
- Career Resource Center
- Student Services
- Unions
- Counseling

Indiana University
- Scholarships and Financial Aids
- Residence Life
- Career Center
- Learning Skills Center
- Student Activities
- Student Legal Services
- Student Health Center (Counseling)
- Judicial Affairs
- Veterans Affairs

University of Minnesota
- Student Support Services
- Student Development Centers
- Housing Office
- Student Activities Office